

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS
Logistics Operations School
Marine Corps Service Support Schools
Training Command
PSC Box 20041
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina 28542-0041

E404

STUDENT OUTLINE

DPR ANALYSIS

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

1. Terminal Learning Objective: Given the billet of maintenance management specialist, applicable maintenance management output reports, and the references, review maintenance management reports, to ensure the accuracy of the reports by detecting and correcting error trends and initiating corrective action.
2. Enabling Learning Objectives: Given the billet of maintenance management specialist, applicable maintenance management output reports, AIS software, and the references:
 - a. Review the accuracy of maintenance management reports against the DPR.
 - b. Validate the DTL against the DPR.
 - c. Correct the discrepancies found in maintenance management reports.
 - d. Determine error trends in unit maintenance reporting.

OUTLINE

1. STEP #1 - COMPARE CATEGORY CODE TO THE TABLE OF AUTHORIZED MATERIEL CONTROL NUMBER (TAMCN)

a. Purpose

(1) To ensure that the category code assigned is compatible with the TAMCN. By compatibility we mean:

(a) Readiness reportable equipment, those who's Table of Authorized Material Control Numbers (TAMCN's) are listed in MCBUL 3000.

(b) Non-readiness reportable equipment, those who's TAMCN's are not listed in MCBUL 3000.

(2) This check will enable you to quickly determine the overall status of your unit's equipment. Is it operational, deadlined, or degraded?

b. Procedures

(1) In your lesson on the ERO, you were told that for readiness reportable equipment, category codes "M", "N", and "X" are applicable. (TAMCN's are listed in MCBUL 3000)

(2) If equipment is non-readiness reportable category codes "P" or "N" will be used.

c. Discrepancies. There are two types of discrepancies if you have assigned the correct TAMCN to your ERO.

(1) A category code assignment of "M" or "X" against non-readiness reportable equipment.

(2) A category code assignment of "P" against readiness reportable equipment.

NOTE: Category code "N" can be assigned to either readiness or non-readiness reportable items of equipment. Only the priority of the ERO determines its applicability.

d. Causes

(1) Outdated MCBUL 3000/UM 4790-5

(2) No MCBUL 3000/UM 4790-5

(3) Not using MCBUL 3000/UM 4790-5

(4) Computer entry errors

(5) Commodity personnel are attempting to keep reportable mission essential equipment off the LM2 report by using category code "P" or "N".

e. Solutions

(1) Check publications listing to ensure availability of MCBUL 3000/UM 4790-5.

(2) Ensure that commodity managers are maintaining copies or have access to MCBUL 3000.

(3) Ensure that commodity managers understand how to properly assign category codes.

(4) Monitor the Daily Transaction Listing (DTL) for input errors.

(5) Finally, educate your Marines (i.e. hold training/ classes).

2. STEP #2 - COMPARE CATEGORY CODE TO ERO PRIORITY

a. Purpose. To ensure that the priority of the ERO falls within the constraints that the criticality of the category code has dictated.

b. Procedures

NOTE: Although the MCO 4400.16_ states priorities 01-10 can be used with category codes "M" and "P" there is a front-end edit. The following category codes and priorities can be used without error within MIMMS AIS.

(1) Category codes "M" and "P" will have an ERO priority of 01-08.

(2) Category code "X" will have an ERO priority of 04-10.

(3) Category code "N" by definition is used with both readiness and non-readiness reportable equipment requiring non-critical repairs. Use priority 11-15 for category code "N" assignments.

(4) Priority of category code "C" ERO's, a base ERO of similar or greater priority must be open.

c. Discrepancies. A couple of them would be:

(1) Category code "M", "P", and "X" with an ERO priority of 11-15.

(2) Category code "N" with an ERO priority of 01-10.

(3) Category code "C" with an ERO priority higher than the priority of the base ERO.

d. Causes. The discrepancies are directly related to:

(1) Personnel not understanding ERO priority assignment for the category codes per MCO 4400.16_/UM 4790-5.

(2) Personnel using outdated publications.

(3) Keypunch errors.

(4) Downgrading the ERO and not changing the ERO priority.

e. Solutions

(1) Ensure that required publications (TM 4700-15/1_/ UM 4790-5) are rated, on hand, and up-to-date.

(2) Ensure proper training and understanding of these directives.

(3) Continue to monitor sources of input and screen for errors.

(4) Publish procedures to be followed for the downgrading and upgrading of ERO priority in the unit Maintenance Management SOP (MMSOP).

3. STEP #3 - COMPARE CATEGORY CODE TO DEFECT CODE

a. Purpose. To ensure that the criticality of the ERO as portrayed by the category code is being correctly reflected by the appropriate defect code.

b. Procedures

(1) At this point, it will be extremely difficult to determine whether or not the defect code reflects the severity of the equipment. So, we must concern ourselves initially with

determining if the two match. A further in-depth analysis occurs when we actually start working with parts on order.

(2) Category codes "M", "P", and "X" should have defect codes that reflect major problems with the equipment. Further, category code "C" ERO's associated with corrective maintenance on "M", "P", or "X" ERO's should also depict a major defect. Category code "N", on the other hand, should not have a defect code that reflects any major problems.

c. Discrepancies

(1) Category code "N" with a defect code of "ENG-RPLC"

(2) Category code "M", "P", or "X" with a defect code of "NMAJ-MINR."

d. Causes. The above discrepancies are attributed to the following:

(1) Maintenance personnel may not be utilizing UM 4790-5 for an all-inclusive listing of defect codes, but instead utilizing a "Cheat Sheet".

(2) Maintenance personnel not updating defect codes as maintenance actions change.

e. Solutions

(1) Ensure availability and utilization of publications.

(2) Ensure personnel are trained in using defect codes described in the UM 4790-5.

4. STEP #4 - COMPARE THE ERO PRIORITY TO PRIORITY OF REQUISITION

a. Purpose. To ensure that the urgency of need for the parts on requisition reflect the urgency of the ERO priority.

b. Procedures. Quickly check the priority of the parts on order to the priority of the ERO. Parts on requisition should not have a higher priority than the priority of the ERO. The priorities assigned to document numbers on an EROSL must logically follow the priority assigned to the ERO.

c. Discrepancies

(1) Priority 06 requisitions with a priority 13 ERO.

(2) Priority 06 requisitions with a priority 03 ERO when there are no priority 03 requisitions open.

d. Causes

(1) ERO priority changed.

(2) Key punch errors.

(3) Personnel not understanding requisitioning priority assignments.

e. Solutions

(1) Make changes where necessary.

(2) Train personnel in assignment of parts priorities.

(3) Publish procedures in MMSOP per MCO 4400.16_.

5. STEP #5 - COMPARE THE DEFECT CODE TO PARTS ON REQUISITION

a. Purpose. To ensure the defect code and parts on requisition are compatible and accurately reflect the malfunction of the equipment.

b. Procedures. Compare the parts on requisition to the defect code to see if they are compatible. For example, if you should see "ENG-MAJ", you would expect to see some major engine components on requisition. This examination process requires a lot of common sense, a familiarity with the technical aspects of the commodity, and some initiative to ask questions or research SL-4s and TMs.

c. Discrepancies

(1) A defect code of "NMAJ-MINR" and a starter on order.

(2) A defect code of "ENG-RPLC" with cushions and a windshield on order.

d. Causes

(1) Personnel not utilizing correct defect codes.

(2) Not updating defect codes as equipment moves through the maintenance cycle.

(3) Parts on requisition do not reflect the defect codes.

e. Solutions

(1) Ensure personnel who are responsible for recording defect codes upon accepting equipment are making a concerted effort to correctly assign a defect code, which most accurately describes the problem.

(2) Ensure personnel are trained in using the defect codes in UM 4790-5.

(3) Ensure that current copies of UM 4790-5 are on hand.

6. STEP #6 - COMPARE THE JOB HISTORY TO DPR RUN DATE

a. Purpose

(1) To establish criteria for acceptable time frames for job history entries.

(2) To identify the length of time equipment has been in a given maintenance status.

b. Procedures. The weekly Exceptions Report serves as a **GUIDELINE** for establishing how long a Job Status is valid. However, the Job Status must reflect the **ACTUAL** status of the equipment.

c. Discrepancies. Those ERO's that exceed the above criteria or the criteria established by your command.

d. Causes/Solutions. The following are a few of the possible solutions the maintenance manager may pursue for corrective action. In many cases, entire policies and procedures may need to be reviewed and revised as T/O and T/E changes take place. You, as the maintenance manager will influence the allocation of maintenance resources.

(1) Time. Have you effectively consolidated maintenance and non-maintenance times into usable blocks?

(2) Personnel. Maintenance personnel are the foundation of your maintenance program. What is their availability, quantity, quality, assignment, highest skill level, best utilization, etc.?

(3) Repair Parts. Have you established requisitioning procedures? Validation, reconciliation, and accountability?

(4) Tools and Equipment. Do your operators and mechanics have their authorized tools to do maintenance?

(5) Facilities. Are your facilities adequate? Have any recommended improvements been submitted?

(6) Funds. Is your unit submitting a budget request? Are you properly monitoring repair parts funds?

(7) Publications. Are your maintenance personnel utilizing their publications, both MCO's and technical?

7. STEP #7 - COMPARE DATE OF THE SHORT PARTS STATUS TO THE DATE PARTS WERE REQUISITIONED

a. Purpose. To ensure that requisitions are submitted in a timely manner.

b. Procedures. Compare the date the ERO went short parts to the document draft date of the requisitions. By doing this you will be able to see how long it takes your supply to process the requisitions.

c. Discrepancies

(1) Job status date of 4050 and the first document draft date is 4060.

(2) Personnel not processing requisitions in a timely manner.

d. Causes

(1) Lack of coordination between supply and maintenance.

(2) Excessive workload at supply.

(3) Personnel shortage at supply.

(4) Lack of MOS training at supply.

(5) Lack of supervision/guidance by supply officer.

e. Solutions

(1) Ensure the unit's MMSOP spells out requisition processing responsibilities and that maintenance and supply adhere to the guidance provided.

(2) Ensure personnel are trained in requisition preparation and process the requisitions with the highest priorities first.

(3) Ensure that requisitioning standards are established for acceptable time frames based on priorities.

8. STEP #8 - COMPARE THE REQUISITION TO REQUISITION SUPPLY STATUS

a. Purpose. To ensure requisitions have status and no corrective action is required on the status.

b. Procedures. Compare the status code to the document draft date, priority, last known holder, and the type of status being provided. When these comparisons are made, you will be able to identify if supply is, or is not, submitting follow-ups within the prescribed time frames and if supply should have picked up the item or submitted tracer action.

c. Discrepancies

(1) Requisitions appearing on the DPR that show no status.

(2) Cancelled or rejected requisitions that have not been reordered.

(3) Requisitions, which reflect release status from the SMU and are outstanding on the DPR in excess of 5 days.

(4) Requisitions showing shipping status from the integrated materiel manager in excess of 30 days.

d. Causes

(1) Corrective actions not taken by supply on requisitions rejected during the inventory update cycle in SASSY.

(2) Lack of understanding supply codes.

(3) Lack of coordination between supply and maintenance.

(4) Lack of effective validation procedures.

(5) Lack of follow-up and tracer action.

e. Solutions

(1) Effective validation procedures in the MMSOP.

(2) Hold training in interpretation of status codes.

(3) Effective Supply SOP.

(4) Aggressive supervision by maintenance and supply.

REFERENCES:

1. MCBUL 3000
2. MCO 4400.16G
3. MCO 3000.11C
4. TM 4700-15/1H
5. UM 4790-5